

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, October 24, 2013  
MAG Office  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Philip McNeely, Phoenix, Chairman	Dan Duffy for Steve Trussell, Arizona Rock Products Association
William Mattingly, Peoria, Vice Chair	Claudia Whitehead, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce
Daniel Culotta, Avondale	# Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors
* John Minear, Buckeye	Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona
# Jim Weiss, Chandler	# Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward
* Jamie McCullough, El Mirage	Kai Umeda, University of Arizona Cooperative Extension
Jessica Koberna, Gilbert	Beverly Chenausky, Arizona Department of Transportation
Doug Kukino, Glendale	Diane Arnst, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Cato Esquivel, Goodyear	* Environmental Protection Agency
Kazi Haque, Maricopa	Thomas Ekren, Maricopa County Air Quality Department
# Greg Edwards for Scott Bouchie, Mesa	Michelle Wilson, Arizona Department of Weights and Measures
Tim Conner, Scottsdale	Ed Stillings, Federal Highway Administration
Antonio DeLaCruz, Surprise	Mariana Garay for Judi Nelson, Arizona State University
Oddvar Tveit, Tempe	Stan Belone, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
* Youngtown	
* Ramona Simpson, Queen Creek	
* American Lung Association of Arizona	
Kristin Watt, Salt River Project	
Rebecca Hudson, Southwest Gas Corporation	
* Ann Carlton, Arizona Public Service Company	
# Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association	
* Robert Forrest, Valley Metro/RPTA	
* Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association	
Jeannette Fish, Maricopa County Farm Bureau	

\*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

#Participated via telephone conference call.

+Participated via video conference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments	Dianne Barker, Citizen
Matt Poppen, Maricopa Association of Governments	John Rusinek, Citizen
Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments	Corky Martinkovic, Maricopa County Air Quality Department
Kara Johnson, Maricopa Association of Governments	Bob Huhn, Maricopa County Air Quality Department
Feng Liu, Maricopa Association of Governments	Joonwon Joo, Arizona Department of Transportation
Adam Xia, Maricopa Association of Governments	Matt Tsark, Strand Association Inc.
Patrick Shaw, Maricopa Association of Governments	Joe Gibbs, City of Phoenix
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments	Mangas Slinkey, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Taejoo Shin, Maricopa Association of Governments	
Randy Sedlacek, Maricopa Association of Governments	
# Scott DiBiase, Pinal County	

## 1. Call to Order

A meeting of the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC) was conducted on October 24, 2013. Phil McNeely, City of Phoenix, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. Greg Edwards, City of Mesa; Jim Weiss, City of Chandler; Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors; Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward; Gina Grey, Western States Petroleum Association; and Scott DiBiase, Pinal County, attended the meeting via telephone conference call.

Chair McNeely indicated that copies of the handouts for the meeting are available. He noted for members attending through audio conference, the presentations for the meeting will be posted on the MAG website under Resources for the Committee agenda, whenever possible. If it is not possible to post them before the meeting, they will be posted after the meeting.

## 2. Call to the Audience

Chair McNeely stated that according to the MAG public comment process, members of the audience who wish to speak are requested to fill out comment cards, which are available on the tables adjacent to the doorways inside the meeting room. Citizens are asked not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. Public comment is provided at the beginning of the meeting for nonagenda items that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG and nonaction agenda items. Chair McNeely noted that two comment cards were received.

Chair McNeely called forward Dianne Barker for public comment. Ms. Barker stated that she resides in Phoenix District 7. She commented on seeing Chair McNeely at the Phoenix Food Drive. Ms. Barker indicated that air quality is related to the goals of the Phoenix Food Drive event. She indicated that she had received an email thanking her for volunteering at the event. The email also indicated that her parking could be validated. Ms. Barker had asked for a bus pass because she uses bicycle, light rail, and bus for transportation. However, she was told a bus pass could not be provided. Ms. Barker commented that she has spoken with policy-makers on reducing pollution and congestion and not expecting people to travel using a certain mode of transportation. Ms. Barker mentioned speaking with policy-makers on not validating parking unless other modes of transportation are being supported as well. She commented on the expansion of the transportation corridor into Pinal County. Ms. Barker noted the issues with PM-10 and PM-2.5 in that area. She stated that the PM nonattainment areas will need to be addressed with the right kind of plans. Ms. Barker indicated that she submitted comments to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) prior to September 27<sup>th</sup> on public participation to create control measures that lead to sustaining the particulate matter standard for three years and into the future. Chair McNeely thanked Ms. Barker for her comments and for volunteering at the City of Phoenix Food Day.

Chair McNeely called forward John Rusinek for public comment. Mr. Rusinek stated that he lives in Phoenix District 6. He indicated that he has a dust problem on a driveway and that he has kept a log of it for eight years. Mr. Rusinek commented that on May 1, 2012 he met with the City of Phoenix. He stated that the City had agreed to look at the driveway. On May 21, 2012, Mr. Rusinek stated that he received a call stating that they would not be coming to inspect the property and that the inspectors at Neighborhood Services indicated the driveway was not used enough to constitute a violation. He mentioned that Neighborhood Services stated that the driveway and right-of-way needed to be dusty enough to show footprints. Mr. Rusinek commented that the driveway and the right-of-way show footprints in the dust. He mentioned Section 39(7)-G of an ordinance that states motor vehicles or trailers

should not be parked or stored upon a lot or area within the City that is not dustproofed. Mr. Rusinek stated that he is speaking under the Call to the Audience to state that nobody has come to see the footprints in the dust. He indicated that the driveway is 81 feet and is not dustproofed. Mr. Rusinek commented that they have tried to dustproof it three times without success. The first 13 feet from the road are not dustproofed. Mr. Rusinek mentioned that according to the City ordinance, the driveway and the right-of-way should be dustproofed. He mentioned that instead of using gravel, decorative rock was used that does not stay in place. Mr. Rusinek stated that the driveway is in worse condition now than when they did nothing. Chair McNeely thanked Mr. Rusinek for his comments.

3. Approval of the August 22, 2013 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the August 22, 2013 meeting. Greg Edwards, City of Mesa, inquired about the information on page nine regarding 2012 being the 112<sup>th</sup> hottest year out of 118. Mr. Poppen replied that the information is correct and that the data was provided by Environ. Spencer Kamps, Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona, moved and Oddvar Tveit, City of Tempe, seconded, and the motion to approve the August 22, 2013 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

4. Update on the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 and Exceptional Events

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided an update on the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10. She discussed the completeness determination issued by EPA on July 20, 2012 for the plan that stopped the 18 month and 24 month sanctions clocks. Ms. Bauer mentioned that EPA has started into the approval process of several statutes in the plan. Ms. Bauer mentioned the lawsuit filed on April 30, 2013 by the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest against EPA for failure to take action on the MAG 2012 Five Percent Plan for PM-10 by February 14, 2013. She stated that on July 1, 2013, EPA completed its review of the 2011-2012 exceptional events documentation. Ms. Bauer indicated that collectively, EPA has concurred with 17 of the 18 packages of exceptional events documents submitted by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ). The results seem to indicate that the region has clean data for the three year period. There were no exceptional events and no violations in 2010. EPA has concurred with the exceptional events documentation for years 2011 and 2012.

Ms. Bauer stated that on August 23, 2013, EPA proposed approval of additional statutes for the measures in the Five Percent Plan. On August 28, 2013, EPA proposed a consent decree to address the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest lawsuit against EPA for not acting on the plan. Ms. Bauer noted that according to the proposed consent decree, EPA would propose action on the plan by January 14, 2014 to either approve the plan, promulgate a federal implementation plan, or approve the plan in part with promulgation of a partial federal implementation plan. She stated that a partial approval equals a disapproval under the Clean Air Act. Ms. Bauer noted that the region does not want any of those options except plan approval. The proposed consent decree also proposes final action by June 2, 2014. She noted that the proposed EPA consent decree has not yet been finalized. Ms. Bauer mentioned that ADEQ and MAG have been hearing positive remarks from EPA. Ms. Bauer discussed another positive update; on September 12, 2013, EPA published a notice that the PM-10 motor vehicle emissions budget is being reviewed for adequacy. This is a step normally taken by EPA before adequacy on the budget is proposed. Ms. Bauer stated that the motor vehicle emissions budget is used for demonstrating conformity for the regional transportation plans.

Ms. Bauer discussed exceptional events. She stated that there have been six exceptional event days in 2013. MAG is working with ADEQ to provide the exceptional event documentation to EPA. Ms. Bauer indicated that MAG staff is currently working on documentation for four of the six exceptional event days. She discussed that on September 6, 2013, United States Senator Jeff Flake hosted a meeting at the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry to discuss that EPA will be opening up the EPA exceptional events rule and may make some changes. Ms. Bauer indicated that this meeting also provided an opportunity for business and industry to voice concerns on the exceptional events rule, and many of the concerns shared are the same as those voiced by the MAG member agencies. Senator Flake is arranging to have an Arizona only listening session with Gina McCarthy, EPA, to give the State an opportunity to convey concerns directly to EPA. The listening session was scheduled for October 1, 2013, however the session did not occur due to the government shutdown. It is in the process of being rescheduled, potentially around November 20, 2013. Ms. Bauer indicated that she will keep the Committee updated on these events. Chair McNeely thanked Ms. Bauer for the update.

5. Update on the MAG 2013 State Implementation Plan Revision for the Removal of Stage II Vapor Recovery Controls

Ms. Bauer provided an update on the MAG 2013 State Implementation Plan (SIP) Revision for the Removal of Stage II Vapor Recovery Controls. She indicated that as discussed at the last meeting MAG has been preparing a Draft 2013 State Implementation Plan Revision to remove Stage II vapor recovery systems at the gasoline stations. This was prompted by a May 2012 final rule published by EPA indicating that the Onboard Refueling Vapor Recovery (ORVR) devices are in widespread use in the motor vehicle fleet and that states may evaluate removing the Stage II control strategy. MAG has been working with the Arizona Department of Weights and Measures, the regulatory agency for Stage II, as well as, ADEQ and the Maricopa County Air Quality Department. The plan revision drafted was to request that EPA remove the requirement for Stage II vapor recovery in this area for new gasoline dispensing facilities in 2014 and existing facilities beginning in 2016, before a disbenefit occurs in 2018. Ms. Bauer indicated that EPA methodologies were used to calculate when the disbenefit would occur. She commented that the type of Stage II controls in the area are not compatible with the ORVR devices on cars. The incompatibility causes a pressure problem in which emissions are released at the gasoline dispensing facilities.

Ms. Bauer stated that the intent of the Arizona agencies in drafting the SIP revision was to prepare and send it to EPA by the end of 2013. This would allow for EPA approval of the revision before the decommissioning of the existing facilities begins. Ms. Bauer noted that the State has been sued before over the removal of measures in air quality plans prior to EPA permission for removal.

Ms. Bauer discussed that at the last meeting, it was reported that emission reductions credits from the closure of Penn Racquet Sports was going to be used as offsets for the small, temporary emission increase the area may experience during the decommissioning of Stage II. However, since the last meeting, it was discovered that this is not a viable option. Ms. Bauer indicated that Maricopa County had then suggested the federal gas can rule because of the air quality benefits of this rule. She mentioned that the Arizona agencies pursued the gas can rule with EPA and EPA had indicated that the rule could be used since it has continuing benefits for several years and adequacy to cover the temporary emission increases from decommissioning Stage II. However, on September 17, 2013, EPA indicated that it had reevaluated the approach for this region to remove Stage II vapor recovery. EPA noted that the Maricopa area has not yet attained the 2008 eight-hour ozone standard of 0.075 parts per million (ppm). The region has a

December 31, 2015 attainment date as a Marginal area. Ms. Bauer stated that this standard is not currently being met at the monitors, however, 2013, 2014, and 2015 are the years that will determine attainment. Ms. Bauer stated that the three year average of the annual fourth high is required for this standard. EPA emphasized that the focus should be on attaining the standard by 2015, rather than on using offsets for temporary emission increases, between 2014 and 2017, which is the same time period that the areas should be attaining the standard. Ms. Bauer commented on the uniqueness of this situation in that the substitute measure, the ORVR devices, are on the vehicles and EPA has indicated that it is in widespread use.

Ms. Bauer reviewed the four options described by EPA for removing Stage II controls keeping in mind the challenge of meeting the 2008 ozone standard by 2015. She stated that to justify a removal schedule for new facilities in 2014 and existing facilities in 2016-2017, the Arizona agencies could do one of four options. The first option is to do a technical demonstration that the area will attain the 2008 eight-hour ozone standard of 0.075 ppm by 2015 and that the increase in emissions will not impact attainment. Ms. Bauer indicated that this option is not possible since the base year that would be used is over the standard. She added that the region may still attain the standard at the monitors by 2015 and noted that no modeling is required for attainment of a Marginal area. The second option is to pass a new control measure to offset the increase in emissions. Ms. Bauer stated that for Marginal areas, EPA has assumed no additional control measures are necessary and attainment will be reached with existing control measures by December 31, 2015. Therefore, a new measure may not be needed. The third option is to request a voluntary bump-up of the nonattainment area to Moderate, which has a later attainment date (six years to attain the standard from designation date). However, this option is not attractive since Moderate areas have more requirements to meet. Ms. Bauer mentioned that it is too early to tell if the region will attain the standard. As an alternative, the fourth option is to keep the 2014 date for removal of Stage II requirements for new facilities and switch to a later 2017-2018 date to decommission existing facilities. This option would then require documentation on how the emission differences are small and temporary. Ms. Bauer noted that Arizona agencies have discussed all of EPA's options.

Ms. Bauer indicated that a new analysis was prepared in response to the EPA options. The analysis was conducted to demonstrate to EPA that during the decommission of Stage II controls the temporary increase in emissions are smaller than leaving the current Stage II vapor recovery requirements in place. Ms. Bauer noted that according to the Federal Register notice, EPA stated that they do not want to cause an unnecessary burden to American business. She added that the increase in emissions is very small. The three scenarios put forward to EPA include: remove Stage II for new facilities in 2014, existing facilities in January 2016 - December 2017; remove Stage II for new facilities in 2014, existing facilities in January 2017 - December 2018 (EPA suggestion); and remove Stage II for new facilities in 2014, existing facilities in October 2016 - September 2018 (decommission after 2016 ozone season). The Arizona agencies preferred the first option which is driven by the disbenefit year of 2018. Ms. Bauer reported that the three scenarios were compared against retaining the current Stage II controls. She mentioned a discussion with EPA with regard to enforcement discretion in which new facilities would not have to install Stage II vapor recovery controls beginning January 1, 2014. EPA replied that they would consider those options and follow up with the Arizona agencies. A conference call between EPA and the Arizona agencies was scheduled for October 1, 2013, however the call did not occur due to the federal government shutdown. The conference call is now being rescheduled. Ms. Bauer stated that the Arizona agencies will need to work together to pursue the best option for removing Stage II controls in the region to avoid any unnecessary burden to Arizona business.

Matt Poppen, Maricopa Association of Governments, presented a table of data for the three scenarios and for retaining Stage II controls. He noted the emissions presented are displayed in metric tons per ozone season day. Mr. Poppen commented that all of the emission increases are very small. He reported that there are no emission increases associated with retaining Stage II controls until the year 2018. After 2018, the disbenefit of retaining Stage II controls increases every year. Compared to the other three options presented to EPA, retaining Stage II controls produces the greatest emission increase. Mr. Poppen stated that the emission increases in the years 2014 and 2015 for the three scenarios are strictly from the installation of new facilities without Stage II controls since existing facilities would not begin removal until 2016 at the earliest. Mr. Poppen indicated that emission increases in the years 2014 through 2017 are the result of removing Stage II controls and emission increases in the years 2018 and 2019 are the result of retaining Stage II controls. All scenarios produce very small emission increases.

Mr. Poppen discussed actions taken by other states to remove Stage II controls. He stated that the information researched online is current, but is subject to change as states move forward with their rule-making processes and submit State Implementation Plan revisions to EPA for approval. Mr. Poppen indicated that many states are choosing to issue enforcement discretion or compliance waivers to allow for the removal of Stage II controls, however, this differs greatly among different regions and states. He noted that the removal of Stage II controls is largely occurring in the ozone nonattainment areas, as opposed to state-wide removal. There are only four states that have required Stage II controls state-wide: Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and California. Mr. Poppen reported that Connecticut issued enforcement discretion allowing new facilities to construct without Stage II controls beginning in February 2012. Indiana has issued enforcement discretion for the removal of Stage II controls at new and modified facilities beginning in April 2013. Major construction to a facility, like installing new dispensing pumps, is an example of a facility under going modification. Massachusetts has issued two enforcement discretion letters for the removal of Stage II controls. The first for new or modified facilities beginning in July 2012 and the second for all facilities as of July 2013. Massachusetts is also requiring enhancement of Stage I systems as part of the Stage II removal process. Missouri initially issued enforcement discretion for new and modified facilities beginning in August 2012, but currently allows all facilities to remove Stage II controls as of March 2013 upon department approval. New York issued enforcement discretion for new and existing facilities to remove Stage II controls beginning January 2011. Pennsylvania issued enforcement discretion for new facilities beginning in July 2012. Texas issued enforcement discretion for new and modified facilities to remove Stage II beginning in May 2012 and Virginia has issued enforcement discretion for new facilities beginning in July 2012.

Mr. Poppen stated that some states have passed statutes or rules allowing for the removal of Stage II controls. Connecticut passed a statute that prohibits the installation of Stage II on or after June 18, 2013 and that all facilities must remove Stage II by July 1, 2015. Florida removed Stage II by rule at new facilities beginning in 2007 and existing facilities in 2010. On June 1, 2009, EPA approved the Florida rule in a Federal Register notice (74 FR 26103). Kentucky has a proposed rule for the removal of Stage II in the Louisville area, however no specifics on the rule were available. Maine repealed Stage II by rule on January 1, 2012 in which all facilities are to remove Stage II by January 1, 2013. New Hampshire had Stage II requirements removed by rule beginning in January 2012 with all facilities required to remove Stage II by December 22, 2015. Ohio exempted new facilities from Stage II by rule beginning April 2013. Mr. Poppen noted that Ohio also has a proposed rule in which all facilities must decommission Stage II by 2017 and install low vapor permeation dispensing hoses. Rhode Island passed a statute in 2012 which exempts new and modified facilities from Stage II requirements. Additionally, Rhode Island proposed a rule to allow decommissioning of all facilities after the effective date of rule, with all facilities

required to decommission by December 22, 2017. The Rhode Island proposed rule also updates Stage I controls. Texas has a proposed rule that requires all facilities to decommission Stage II by August 31, 2018 and that allows decommissioning to begin 30 days after EPA approval of the rule. Vermont passed a statute in 2009 that phased out Stage II for new facilities; all facilities are allowed to decommission beginning January 1, 2013 and have two years to decommission. Virginia has a proposed rule that would allow for all facilities to begin decommissioning on January 1, 2017. Lastly, Wisconsin passed a statute in 2011 that allowed removal of Stage II controls for all facilities upon EPA determination of widespread use which was made in May 2012.

Mr. Poppen presented Clean Air Act 110(l) demonstrations in State Implementation Plan (SIP) revisions that seek to remove Stage II controls. He commented that revisions to the SIP must demonstrate that removal of Stage II controls will not interfere with attainment or progress towards attainment. The following demonstrations were made by states to demonstrate that removing Stage II controls will not interfere with attainment of the ozone standard in their respective areas.

Rhode Island has a disbenefit for Stage II controls beginning in 2018. The Rhode Island revision proposes that all facilities are to decommission by December 22, 2017 and includes updates to Stage I controls. Mr. Poppen stated that their 110(l) analysis states that the emission increases from the removal of Stage II are small and will not interfere with attainment. Currently, Rhode Island is designated unclassifiable/attainment for the 2008 ozone standard, however one of the Rhode Island monitor is recording levels above the 2008 ozone standard.

Mr. Poppen discussed that the Virginia disbenefit of Stage II controls occurs in 2017. The Virginia revision proposes to remove Stage II requirements beginning January 1, 2017. The 110(l) analysis states that decommissioning begins during the disbenefit year and also discusses how declining emissions from other sources more than compensates for any Stage II benefit that might be lost. The 110(l) analysis also includes a demonstration that NO<sub>x</sub> reductions are more effective than VOC reductions in the area; this area is in attainment of the 2008 ozone standard.

Mr. Poppen stated that Wisconsin has a disbenefit year of 2016. The Wisconsin statute and revision allows for removal of Stage II controls after the EPA widespread use determination which was made in May 2012. The 110(l) analysis uses emission credits from closed point source facilities to offset benefits of Stage II controls before the disbenefit year. On June 11, 2013, EPA proposed to approve this demonstration in a Federal Register notice (78 FR 34966). Mr. Poppen noted that this is currently the only recent EPA proposed approval of a 110(l) analysis for removal of Stage II controls. Parts of Wisconsin are designated as a Marginal nonattainment area for the 2008 ozone standard.

Mr. Poppen reported on the 110(l) analysis for Texas. He stated that Texas does not have a disbenefit from Stage II controls because the gasoline dispensing facilities are ORVR compatible. However, Texas proposes that all facilities decommission Stage II by August 31, 2018. The Texas 110(l) analysis shows that benefits of Stage II are less than one percent of the VOC inventory. Texas also presents ozone modeling that shows a maximum 0.02 parts per billion increase in ozone concentrations after removal of Stage II controls. Texas has one Moderate and one Marginal nonattainment area for the 2008 ozone standard.

Mr. Poppen discussed that Missouri does not have a disbenefit year from Stage II controls due to ORVR compatibility at gasoline dispensing facilities. No firm date has been set in the draft Missouri revision for Stage II removal, however in March 2013 the state has allowed the decommissioning of Stage II at

all facilities under department approval of each facility that requests removal. The 110(l) analysis demonstrates that mobile source emissions decline after removal of Stage II controls and that the benefits of Stage II controls are small. The analysis also provides a comparison of current mobile source inventories against mobile source inventories in the approved SIP. The current mobile source inventories are smaller than what is in the SIP, thus arguing that the SIP has surplus mobile emissions that could be used to offset the increase in emissions from the removal of Stage II controls. The St. Louis area is designated a Marginal nonattainment area for the 2008 ozone standard.

Mr. Poppen stated that several states have not taken any action on Stage II, such as Nevada. California has decided to retain Stage II controls. He commented on the wide variety of approaches with regard to Stage II controls. Mr. Poppen thanked the Committee.

#### 6. Status Report on the Eight-Hour Ozone Monitoring Data

Julie Hoffman, Maricopa Association of Governments, gave a status report on the eight-hour ozone monitoring data. She stated that the Maricopa ozone nonattainment area is currently classified as a Marginal area for the 2008 eight-hour ozone standard of 0.075 ppm. The region has a December 31, 2015 attainment date. MAG has been closely tracking the ozone monitoring data. She indicated that a list of ozone exceedances for the 2013 ozone season have been provided at each place. This year there were a total of 53 ozone exceedances that occurred on 13 different days. Ms. Hoffman noted that these numbers are considerably lower than what was experienced in 2012. She commented that the region had over 100 exceedances on 28 different days in 2012.

Ms. Hoffman referred to another table provided at each place that displays the three year average of the annual fourth high, which is how the standard is calculated. For the 2011-2013 time period, there are 10 violating monitors that are highlighted in bold. This is one more violating monitor than 2012. Ms. Hoffman noted that the highest three year average of the annual fourth high remained the same at 0.081 ppm and is again at the North Phoenix monitor. She mentioned that the number of violating monitors has stayed high due to the elevated ozone levels the region experienced in 2011 and 2012. The concentrations for 2013 are more similar to 2010 values. Ms. Hoffman noted that with the December 31, 2015 attainment date, it will be the 2013 through 2015 data will be used to determine attainment of the standard.

#### 7. Winter Holiday No Burn Campaign

Chair McNeely introduced Corky Martinkovic, Maricopa County Air Quality Department, and Bob Huhn, Maricopa County Air Quality Department, to present the Winter Holiday No Burn Campaign. Ms. Martinkovic presented a graph of PM-2.5 emissions from December 2012 to January 2013. She noted the spikes in PM-2.5 emissions over the holiday season, especially Christmas Eve and New Years Day. Ms. Martinkovic indicated that these spikes in PM-2.5 emissions are the reason for the No Burn Campaign. She discussed that Maricopa County is watching the activity at the monitors and will be conducting a speciation study to garner a better understanding of the increase in PM-2.5 emissions during the winter holidays. Ms. Martinkovic added that the County is involved in a cooperative task force with ADEQ to work on a campaign to address these spikes in PM-2.5 emissions. She discussed how the PM-2.5 standard is calculated and that these spikes impact two years since they usually occur in December and January. This campaign aims to address the PM-2.5 emission increases to keep the region in attainment of the PM-2.5 standard. Ms. Martinkovic stated that the campaign is geared toward the predominant activity during this time, which is woodburning in fireplaces, fire pits, and other types of



wood burning activities. The goal of the campaign is to educate people on the importance of not burning wood, which includes compressed logs, on no burn days.

Mr. Huhn discussed the No Burn Campaign. He indicated that the campaign is taking an aggressive approach to reach as many different areas and demographics as possible to avoid PM-2.5 nonattainment status. Mr. Huhn explained that the PM-2.5 spikes are observed all over the region; some monitors are recording almost three times the health standard, on days such as New Years Day. He commented that many stakeholders including City of Phoenix, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, and Southwest Gas are currently aiding with the campaign. Mr. Huhn stated that more help and ideas with the campaign would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Huhn presented the many media tools that will be used in the campaign. He displayed a campaign billboard with the slogan “No Burn Day? Don’t Burn Wood!” and the call to action is CleanAirMakeMore.com. Mr. Huhn reported that Lamar Advertising had donated billboard signs last year and more billboards will be purchased through them. He mentioned that the City of Mesa, as well as other municipalities, have donated the use of the City’s digital message boards. Mr. Huhn indicated that a special “No Burn Day” billboard has been created for billboards that have the option for different signage on specific days. He added that the “No Burn Day” sign will also be made into signage that can be used specifically on no burn days; he gave the example of having magnetized signs made to be placed on vehicles. Mr. Huhn mentioned that the Arizona Department of Transportation freeway signs will also be used on no burn days thanks to help from Amanda McGennis, Associated General Contractors. A poster was presented that will also be part of the campaign that includes the slogan “Don’t let our air go up in smoke.” Mr. Huhn mentioned working with the Grocers Association and Basha’s to have posters in grocery stores/supermarkets near where wood is sold. The poster will also be used by Valley Metro and other organizations. Mr. Huhn stated that the campaign is in the process of finalizing radio service announcements. Additionally, he indicated that the campaign just finished filming a television public service announcement (PSA) with Hall of Fame basketball player Ralph Sampson. Mr. Huhn discussed that there will be a 30-second and a 90-second PSA and that some television stations have already agreed to run the PSAs. He mentioned the potential to partner with news station meteorologists and smaller newspapers in the region. Mr. Huhn provided still shots of a previous PSA featuring a coughing camel. He stated that Valley Metro has given permission to revitalize the coughing camel PSA. He mentioned that using this notable PSA could bring more publicity to the campaign.

Mr. Huhn encouraged ideas and suggestions on tools to get the word about this campaign out to as many people as possible. Ms. McGennis stated that the Associated General Contractors Board of Directors has been notified about this campaign and are in agreement. She mentioned they will be sending out payroll notifications slips with the campaign message. Ms. McGennis discussed the impact nonattainment would have on Arizona industry. She also expressed interest in the magnetic signs for contractor vehicles on no burn days. Mr. Huhn thanked Ms. McGennis for her assistance with the campaign. He stated that additionally the campaign will be featured on public affair shows, including Horizon. Mr. Huhn discussed that the campaign will include a strong effort in the Spanish language community in a variety of formats: newspaper, television, and radio.

A member of the audience asked about raising the price of coal. Mr. Huhn replied that the key message of the campaign is to not burn wood on no burn days when PM-2.5 creates a health issue. The message is not to restrict wood burning activities completely. Rebecca Hudson, Southwest Gas Corporation, indicated that natural gas fireplaces, indoor and outdoor, can be used on no burn days. She stated that Southwest Gas Corporation will be including inserts in their November and December billings to remind

people of the campaign message. Mr. Huhn commented that natural gas fireplaces and EPA approved devices are okay to burn on no burn days, the message is not to burn wood on no burn days.

Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, inquired about the PM-2.5 exceedances. Ms. Bauer responded that the region does not want to become a PM-2.5 nonattainment area. She noted that the purpose of this campaign is to prevent the spikes in PM-2.5 emissions that may cause an exceedance of the standard. Ms. Bauer stated that the Maricopa region is in attainment of the PM-2.5 standard. Ms. Martinkovic added that monitors are now watched for PM-2.5 rapid response, similarly to the PM-10 rapid response program. Efforts will be mobilized when PM-2.5 levels are elevated. Ms. Martinkovic commented that all PM-2.5 sources are evaluated around the monitors. Mr. Kukino asked about enforcement. Ms. Martinkovic replied that there is a complaint process. The first step after a complaint is a warning letter and then a process for compliance. Ms. Martinkovic noted that many complaints are in residential areas which makes enforcement difficult and the goal is to inform people through the campaign. The County expects to see a spike in complaints this season in reaction to the campaign.

Mannie Carpenter, Valley Forward, inquired about fireworks and PM-2.5. Ms. Martinkovic responded that some states have analyzed the impact of fireworks on PM-2.5. She indicated that the County has not seen direct impact of fireworks on monitoring data, however PM-2.5 is a small particle that travels easily. Ms. Martinkovic indicated that the County will be analyzing the impact from other PM-2.5 sources besides woodburning.

Diane Arnst, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, commented on the mobile phone application to receive no burn day notifications. Mr. Huhn stated that no burn days and more information can be found at the Clean Air Make More website and the Clean Air Make More mobile phone application. He stated that the mobile phone application will have no burn information, weather, alerts, and a way to submit air quality violations. Mr. Huhn reported that the mobile phone application has exceeded expectations, with 6,500 apps downloaded. He mentioned that the mobile application can be a tool to parents and educators with regard to family and education activities. Mr. Huhn thanked the Committee.

#### 8. Call for Future Agenda Items

Chair McNeely requested suggestions for future agenda items. He indicated that the next meeting of the Committee has been tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, December 3, 2013.

With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:35 p.m.